

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/534,376	Applicant(s) ALITALO ET AL.	
	Examiner Eileen B. O'Hara	Art Unit 1646	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Eileen B. O'Hara. (3) _____.

(2) David A. Gass. (4) _____.

Date of Interview: 21 February 2001.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1-39.

Identification of prior art discussed: _____.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

i) ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview (if box is checked).

Unless the paragraph above has been checked, THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Given the statutory time period set for this office action

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Mr. Gass was informed by telephonic message from the Examiner that claim 27, drawn to a method of gene therapy, had been overlooked in the previous restriction requirements, was now being put into a separate group, but to expedite prosecution and prevent another written restriction from being sent, a telephonic election could be made if he chose. Mr. Gass responded by telephonic message that he wanted to elect the methods of treatment with the polypeptide, which was the group elected in the response to the last restriction requirement, but since he had traversed the previous rejection, he also wanted to traverse the method of gene therapy as a separate group and be able to respond as such to the next office action.